

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY

RFP 03-5107-8820; INTEGRATED FINANCIAL/HR MANAGEMENT SYS.

LIST OF FIRMS ATTENDING PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE

1. Kutti Tech, Inc.
2. Cherry Road Technologies
3. Sierra Systems
4. Lawson Software
5. Unisys Corporation
6. Cedar consulting
7. SAP Public Service
8. Kay D. Ide
9. Kronos, Inc.
10. NewTech Solutions
11. Deloitte & Touche LLP
12. Bearing Point
13. Sungard Bi-Tech
14. Sartox, LLC
15. Community College Work Force Alliance
16. Strategic Information Solutions, Inc.
17. Oracle Corporation
18. SAIC
19. Integral Systems, Inc.
20. EA Consulting
21. Socius Corporation
22. PeopleSoft
23. Munis, Inc.
24. Sekon enterprises, Inc.
25. EIS / Xcelicor
26. Computer Associates
27. IBM Corporation
28. J D Edwards
29. Softscape, Inc.
30. Maximus
31. Empower Solutions, Inc.
32. Storagetek
33. Webmethods, Inc.

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

1. Reference Attachment C Pre-Qualification Form question 2, 3 & 4..."Is pre-qualification pertaining to the prime or team?"

Response: Pre-qualification pertains to the prime implementation firm.

2. Para 2.5, Sub Para 2.5.10..."Is Implementation Consultant and staff interchangeable?"

Response: Yes.

3. Section 1.5 Project Scope page #6: Can the County/Schools please be more specific on what they expect from the winning vendor as it relates to "Strategic Oversight" of the Change Management Plan and "assistance" with business process re-engineering?

Response:

"Strategic Oversight" – The County is looking for the consultant to develop and support execution of a plan, working with County staff. The County plans for a full-time resource to work with this consultant with others to be assigned as needed.

"Assistance with business process re-engineering". The County expects most of our processes to change as the result of implementing new software. However, the County identified a few critical business processes where user acceptance of changed processes will contribute greatly to a successful implementation. We want to be certain that the Offerors will be providing expert business process re-design services in these areas.

4. RFP page 6

The County stipulates they want change management assistance on this project but that they will undertake a majority of the activities. What areas of emphasis does the County see falling under change management, and in what areas does the County believe it may need assistance?

Response: See the response to question 3. Assistance is needed to market the culture change required to successfully implement an integrated system, with information targeted to different audiences within the organization. Variation in County-wide processes has evolved due to manual processing (levels of approval, less emphasis on complete and accurate work when handoffs occur, etc.). We want the consultant to bring in and support a change management strategy that will help us overcome these, as well as other issues, local governments and school systems have faced as they completed similar implementations.

5. Section 1.5 Project Scope page #6: We request that the County explain the background for their stated preferred phasing: Phase I = HR/Payroll with a go-live of Jan 2005 and Phase II = Financials with a go-live of July 2005.

Response: The County is at risk of losing support for the version of HR/Payroll installed and for having failures with an aspect of HR processing that drives School payroll.

6. RFP page 7

The RFP references two possible "subphases" for the HR/Payroll implementation. Can the County be more specific about how it might want this effort staged?

Response: See the response to Question 5. The County needs to ensure we have vendor support for Payroll processing. The proposal "subphases" address the more immediate need for payroll processing, allowing more time to implement additional human resources functionality.

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

7. Section 1.5 Project Scope page #7: Is the County willing to entertain a start in January or February 2004?

Response: If contract approval can be obtained from the Board of Supervisors and the IT infrastructure can be in place when needed, then yes.

8. Section 2.5 Specific Terms and Conditions of the Contract.

Q.1 subsection 2.5.2 - page #16: The County has stated they will only accept bids from software firms, does that imply that an implementation partner cannot be the prime?

Q.2 RFP page 16, Section 2.5.2

Could you please clarify "The County will only accept proposals from software firms...". Our question is should a software company have more than one certified implementer, the implementer would be the prime for the proposal, not the software company. Would the County consider amending this section to clarify that a certified software implementation firm may be the prime.

~~Response: That sentence should be corrected to read "from software and implementation services firms". The implementation partner can be the prime.~~

Revised response: The software vendor is the prime vendor during selection only. This means that all requests during selection will go through the software contact. If there are any third-party vendors involved in a particular software proposal, it is the responsibility of the software vendor to disseminate information to them during selection. For implementation, the "prime vendor" is negotiable.

9. Section 2.5 Specific Terms and Conditions of the Contract.

subsection 2.5.9 - page #17: Will the SOW developed with the County contain all requirements of the RFP including HR/PA/FMS implementation services, development of interfaces, ESS implementation and training, all data conversion, etc.; or will the County only include those items which can be accommodated by it's budget?

Response: The County intends to include all items identified in subsection 1.5: Project Scope of the RFP in the SOW. If we encounter funding constraints that cannot be resolved, we may adjust scope of the project.

10. Section 2.5 Specific Terms and Conditions of the Contract.

subsection 2.5.10 - page #17: We request that the County be more specific about the orientation requirement as it relates to policies and procedures of the County? Are these policies and procedures related to existing HR/PA/FMS policies and procedures? If so, please clarify at what level this orientation must take place?

Response: The policies and procedures in this section refer to the procedures established between the consultant and the County as to how we will work together; work hours, problem reporting, status reporting, etc.

11. Section 2.5 Specific Terms and Conditions of the Contract.

Q.1 subsection 2.5.12 - page #17: Will the County negotiate a retainage lower than 20% along with payment of agreed upon retainage at mutually negotiated milestones rather than payment in 2005 at the conclusion of the project?

Q.2 Are the terms and conditions "negotiable" to the winning vendor?

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

Q.3 Is the 20% retainage negotiable? Can a respondent offer alternative arrangements?

Q4 Reference: Page #16 – 2.5.5 Proposals on implementation services are expected to be on a “not-to-exceed” basis where the County compensates Offerors on the basis of hours and expenses incurred up to a ceiling amount. **And** Reference: Page #17 – 2.5.12 Retainage: Payments to the Contractor for implementation services will be made at milestones to be agreed upon by the Contractor and the County. Question: Would you please clarify the County’s expectation pertaining to invoicing by the Contractor for implementation services?

~~Response: If an Offeror does not agree to one or more of the terms and conditions as stated in the RFP, an exception should be made as instructed in Section 4.11 of the RFP. These issues will be addressed during contract negotiations.~~

Revised Response: If an Offeror does not agree to one or more of the terms and conditions as stated in the RFP, an exception should be made as instructed in Section 4.11 of the RFP. It is the County’s intent to have payments for services tied to deliverables. These issues will be addressed during contract negotiations.

12. Section 4.8 References - page #34: If an implementation vendor teams with other partners, to meet the mix of school and government references, can the five implementation references be from all partners involved?

~~Response: We are looking for five references from the prime vendor. Additional references for other partners proposed to be involved will be considered.~~

Revised Response: We are looking for five references from the prime vendor. A minimum of three is acceptable, however, more consideration will be given for firms who meet the initial requirement. Responses will be evaluated based on the quantity and quality of references provided. Offerors submitting the minimum of three local government and school references are encouraged to submit other public sector or non-profit references with similar processing requirements. Additional references for other partners proposed to be involved will be considered.

The proposal will be considered responsive if a total of three local government and school references of similar size are provided.

13. Q.1 Please confirm that the implementation scope involves: 1) separate Schools and County implementations for human resources, payroll and budgeting; and 2) an integrated Schools and County implementation for the financial applications.

Q.2 Please confirm that the County expects one financials implementation to cover the "County" (both the "Government" and the "Schools")? Likewise, please confirm that the County will require two separate HR/Payroll implementations (one for the "Government" and another one for the "Schools")?

Response: The Government and the Schools clearly have different requirements in the areas of human resources, payroll and budgeting and are thinking we will need to have separate teams working on the details of the implementation. We are looking for the Offerors, who have more knowledge about how the software functions, to propose whether or not they should be separate implementations.

The financial applications will be a joint implementation, with Government staff in the lead role obtaining input and some participation from School staff, our largest internal customer. The

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

exception to this is the Budget development area, where School requirements are different from the Government.

14. RFP page 14

RFP states that four CDs be submitted with the hard bound copies. RFP Page 36 states that the cost schedules and detail be provided on CD-ROM in MS-Office 2000. Does the County desire a separate CD with the cost pricing sheets? Please clarify.

Response: The cost pricing worksheets should be on the same CD with the rest of the submission. We do not desire a separate CD with the cost pricing sheets.

15. RFP page 16, Section 2.5 Specific Terms and Conditions

If the vendor has a contract with terms and conditions with Commonwealth, which may be extended to localities, may these terms and conditions be used with this RFP response?

Response: Chesterfield County prefers to use our terms and conditions for contractual agreements.

16. RFP page. 7, Section 1.5

When do you anticipate the start date of the financials with County resources committed at that timeframe?

Response: We can be prepared to begin anytime from March 2004 to July 2004 timeframe, using the schedule agreed upon to support go live at July 1, 2005 for core financials.

17. RFP page 12, Section 2.1.24 and page 70

As part of the evaluation process, are award "points" given for the use of participation of minority, woman-owned and Chesterfield County businesses, or is it just "encouraged" (second paragraph). If points are awarded, are there different values for the different categories, and if so, what are the point breakdowns.

Response: We are not authorized by policy to award points for minority, women-owned and Chesterfield County businesses; however, we strongly encourage the use of all three.

18. RFP page 56 Grants Information: Purpose

Track detail...(sometimes as many as 20)". We price this module per application user. How many application users should we include in our response, 20?

Response: ~~We are researching the response to this question.~~

Revised response: We anticipate 75 users of the grants module, performing functions such as setting up the award, monitoring the revenue/reimbursements received, and managing the grants.

19. RFP pages 35, 36 Section 4.12 Cost Proposal

Should the sw costs of "future requirements" be included in the pricing matrix? We understand that implementation costs are not required. If so, how many application users require the future requirements in your functional category "Assets Management". Some of these require a different product from our fixed accounting asset module.

Response: Pricing for software future requirements for fixed assets should not be included if it is a separate module. If this same question is applicable to RFP requirements in other functional areas, it needs to be asked separately.

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

20. RFP page 46 Appendix B User Counts and p. 60 HR/Payroll info.
How many of the 13,300 employees would be entering their time using a web based time entry system? How many of these users are core purchasing, core human resources?

~~Response: 10,500 would be using web based time entry. We are researching the number of "core purchasing and core human resources users".~~

Revised response (based on clarification from submitter): Of the 10,500 we anticipate using web based time entry, the breakdown is as follows:

About 7,100 are School employees entering leave transactions as leave is taken

About 860 are substitutes entering time worked

About 400 are County part-time employees entering time worked

About 2,140 are County employees entering leave transactions as leave is taken

Of the 810 users, 480 prepare purchasing requisitions

Of the 810 users, 8 procurement professionals prepare bids and evaluate results

Of the 810 users, 50 initiate budget entries

Of the 810 users, 50 initiate capital project budgets

Of the 810 users, 225 initiate personnel requisitions and salary changes

Of the 810 users, 110 approve personnel requisitions and salary changes

Of the 460 users, 460 evaluate employee performance, interview and hire employees

21. RFP page 258 Training

Will the County be tracking training processes (i.e. rooms, costs, roster for enrollment etc.) of all 13,300 employees? If not, what is the correct number of employees that the County wishes to maintain the info required in this section? Core HR tracks the employee training history, we are trying to ascertain the accurate head count for the training section as it pertains to these specific requirements.

~~Response: We will respond to this question once it is clarified.~~

Revised response (based on clarification from submitter): The County will be registering and tracking instructor – led training for 2,600 employees.

We will be delivering web-based training for 1,000 employees; all are in the 2,600 number.

We need to track certifications and licensure requirements for about 7,100, which are not included above, and for another 400 employees, which are included as part of the 2,600.

22. Please confirm availability of County/School resources to participate on the project team. Will there be a group of full-time, dedicated Government/School employees assigned to this project?

Response: Yes. There will also be some employees assigned less than full-time. The project team will be co-located with consultants at a separate location.

23. RFP Section 3.4 What happens if the Demonstrations provide clarification to an earlier response in the functional requirements such that a modification/customization should be desirable by the County? Can the bid price be modified at this later date?

Response: See Section 3.6 Phase IV – Contract Negotiations. Through this process, there will be an opportunity for the County and each of the vendors elevated after demonstrations to communicate changes resulting from additional information gained during demonstrations.

24. RFP Section 4.2

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

The County requests that vendors address "mitigation of potential risks". From the County perspective, what does it see as the key potential risks?

Response: Below are some key potential risks from the County's perspective, however, we want the response to represent the vendors' knowledge and experience.

- Failure to meet project milestones and budget.
- Resistance to operational change.
- Wrong or in-experienced vendor staff assigned to project.
- Managing communications and user expectations in a diverse environment.

25. RFP Section 4.5 A.4 - Chart of Accounts

Does the County envision having the COA laid exactly as specified in the RFP?

Response: These are the chart of account elements required. We would be interested in modifying or supplementing this structure if there are additional COA capabilities that would be beneficial to the County.

26. Is the County interested or would they consider receiving a quote on remote application support services? We find many customers like the ability to choose a vendor's remote support for applications providing skilled application expertise, especially at the beginning of a new ERP implementation until they build up their internal support expertise.

Response: This is not a requirement that will be specifically evaluated as part of the selection criteria. If you think it would add value to services being proposed, you are free to include it.

27. Would the County consider a two week extension? We have 2 other significant proposals due at the same time--one just before July 4th; one due July 9th. Any consideration appreciated.

Response: No, the County's time schedule does not permit an extension.

28. If the proposal takes exception to the "not to exceed" requirement, will the bid be considered non responsive? If the proposal offers a firm fixed price will the bid be considered responsive?

~~Response: Firm fixed price bids will be considered responsive, however, the County has asked for and prefers "not to exceed" pricing.~~

Revised response: The RFP asks for, and the County expects to receive, "not to exceed" pricing. Vendors who choose not to submit "not to exceed" pricing will be at a disadvantage, although firm fixed price bids will be considered responsive.

29. 4.6.8 Portals, p. 29.

"The proposed system must provide access to selected audiences with a secure single-sign-on to enterprise wide information and business functions in a personalized format"

Does the "single-sign-on" apply to LAN users and/or can it be used with a VPN solution that has a separate log-in to the VPN client and then, for security purposes, a separate but additional "single-sign-on" for the application portal?

Response: "Single-sign-on" applies to one LAN and/or VPN sign-on with NO additional "single-sign-on" for the application portal.

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

30. Re: Page 40
Which Laser Fiche products exactly do you have from the Laser Fiche product suite? (does not specify)

Response: LaserFiche Document Management, WebLink, Snapshot, Audit Trails and Intergrator's Toolkit.

31. Re: Page 151
Will system archive items on microfiche or on some other form of archive storage?
Would Laser Fiche play a role in archiving items, if so what?

Response: At the present the County does not use LaserFiche to archive County computer generated reports, listings or files. The County will consider the use of LaserFiche for archiving based on department's requirements and budget approval for request.

32. Page 164 "Provides for multiple security profiles for a single user. Generates warning messages to notify administrator if multiple security profiles applied to a single user are conflicting."
Please give an example of the use of multiple security profiles for a single user.

Response: For example, a user in the Accounting department is the security administrator for the General Ledger module and also is a supervisor for a section of Accounting with purchase requisition and timesheet approval authority. One profile would grant access to the security area of the General Ledger system only. The other profile would be used for a normal type supervisor role of approving requisitions and approving timesheets of employees. A security administrator profile should never have access to areas outside of the security functions within the system nor should a supervisor profile have access to the security area.

33. Page 166 "Provides interfaces to the County's GIS system."
Please give an example of the use of the County's GIS system and the ERP system.

Response: This GIS requirement should be marked as a "future requirement" as requirement AM 11.00 is (Asset Management). The interfaces would be related to asset locations, and possibly the identification of subdivisions and/or lots where the County is holding funds for future development.

34. Page 230 "System install tools or software for installs across all landscapes."
Please define all landscapes.

Response:

Technical Landscapes

Development Landscape supports the following activities:

- New system design and construction
- Testing
- Enhancements to existing systems
- Installation and testing of package systems
- Development and testing of reusable components
- Development and testing of Web content pages
- Documentation to support work activities

Staging Landscape supports the following activities:

- Test new or changed business systems
- Train customers

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

Production Landscape supports the following activities:

- The Production Landscape is comprised of multiple components consisting of hardware, software, and controls to effectively support the business of Chesterfield County.

Maintenance Landscape supports the following activities:

- Test minor low risk changes to business system
- Test resolutions to problems

Technical Landscape supports the following activities:

- Install and test operating systems
- Install and test database software
- Install and test desktop software and hardware
- Install and test server software and hardware
- Install and test infrastructure management software
- Install and test security software
- Install and test new software in support of other landscapes
- Documentation to support work activities

35. Page 291 BA 6.00 “In addition to the above listed human resource components that are integrated with Employee Benefits, a number of County systems and internal and external organizations will be interfaced to the system”.

Please define what County systems and internal and external organizations.

Response: See Appendix H for a listing of interfaces.

36. Integrated System: Reference: Page #5 – 1.3 Overview of Project

Is it the intent of the County to select and implement software from the same vendor for both Human Resource/Payroll and Financial applications?

Response: Yes

37. Parallel Processing: Reference: Page #7 – 1.5 Project Scope. As certain functionality is implemented, parallel processing of the new system(s) may be necessary to ensure completeness and accuracy. Does the County have specific requirements and periods for parallel processing for areas such as Payroll, Benefits, and Financials in general?

~~Response: The County does not have specific requirements or periods for parallel processing. We are expecting Offerors to recommend activities that will ensure a successful implementation.~~

Revised response: While the County does not have specific requirements for parallel processing, we realize the vendor's implementation methodology may recommend this activity during testing. The County would not expect to conduct parallel processing in the production environment. It is our expectation that Offerors recommend and oversee implementation activities and testing prior to “go live” to ensure accurate processing in the production environment.

38. Locality Responsibilities: Reference: Page #16 – 2.4 We assume that all/most work will be performed on site at the County's location, will adequate office space and equipment be provided by the County for the contractor's implementation team?

Response: The County is planning to provide and equip an off-site location for County staff and contractor staff.

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

39. Q.1 Implementation Interviews: Reference: Page #20 – 3.0 the event of implementation interviews with elevated offerors. Would you please clarify what the County envisions the implementation interview process to be?

Q.2 Phase II and Phase III: Reference: Page #21 – 3.4 Phase II – Demonstrations and page #22 3.5 – Phase III – Further evaluation of elevated offerors. As this will be **a combined proposal that delivers both software and implementation services** (page #4 1.1) what is the County's expectation, other than reference verification, regarding the implementation service offeror during these phases of the evaluation?

Response: The County expects the implementation services firm and the software firm to partner during all phases of the evaluation process. The implementation interview process will be part of the agenda for the scripted demonstrations. Elevated Offerors will receive an agenda and scripts two weeks prior to the scheduled date.

Also, as part of the scripted demonstration process, we expect a separate demonstration lab be set up and staffed so subject matter experts who have attended the scripted demonstration can have questions answered.

Offerors need to be responsive to any additional questions or issues that need to be addressed.

- 41 Implementation Services Firm, references: Reference: Page #34, (Proposal section 7) Would the County consider an implementation services firm compliant with the requirements outlined in this section if the references supplied were public sector clients (as stated in the project introduction , page 4 – 1.1), but the number of schools were less than the 3 stated in this section.

Response: Our preference is three, however at least one similar size school reference is acceptable.

42. History to convert: Reference: Page #67 – Appendix I. Does the Vendor File identified include the Vendor History File as well? Since the Financials implementation is expected to be July 1, 2005 would the County expect the vendor history records to be converted for the first six month of the year 2005 for at least the 1099 vendors?

Response: The Vendor file does not include the Vendor History File. If summary information for 1099 reporting can be entered into the system as one transaction, we would manually convert these balances due to the number of 1099s.

43. History to convert: Reference: Page #67 – Appendix I. There is no mention of budget data conversion in this appendix. Is there no requirement to convert budget data?

Response: There is no requirement to convert budget data if the current schedule of live July 1, 2005 is met.

44. History to convert: Reference: Page #67 – Appendix I. It is stated here that there are several years of Human Resource data and a couple of years of detailed purchasing/invoice information pertaining to ancillary systems in user departments.

General Response: We are further evaluating the need to convert this data. Therefore, the responses to this question are subject to change.

- a. With regards to the couple of years of financial data, would the County clarify its expectations regarding "beginning balance"

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

conversion of the general ledger vs. the detail level conversation of invoice/purchasing data?

Response: The County has some purchase orders which remain open for multiple years as capital projects improvements are completed. The County wants to explore converting some basic information related to previous invoices and payments against a purchase order. There may be an alternative to entering this historical information other than through data conversion.

- b. In how many departments do these ancillary systems exist?

Response: Two or three

- c. Are these ancillary systems all the same or very similar, or can they be different within each department?

Response: Different within each department.

45. Previous RFP: In May of 2000, Chesterfield County and Public Schools issued an RFP (#00-5226-8386) for a Financial Systems Requirements Analysis, for which we submitted a bid.

- (a) What is the relationship of this past effort, if any, with the Integrated Financial/HR Management System?

Response: The effort resulted in an RFP being developed and issued for software in December 2000. That selection effort was halted in November 2001 and later closed in Spring 2002 due to uncertainty related to funding.

- (b) Is there any outcome from the previous effort which will influence your decision in acquiring and implementing an integrated Financial/HR Management solution?

Response: No

- (c) Will the successful bidder of the previous initiative be permitted to bid on this RFP?

Response: Yes

46. How many years of data are expected to be held online in the new system?

Response: The County has not decided on a number of years. The number of years will be determined by the software chosen, storage requirements and performance of the system in addition to legal and user department requirements.

47. Does the county have a technology preference in terms of hardware, database, and/or operating system?

Response: The County's standard databases are Oracle, DB2 and Microsoft SQL Server. The County has no preference for hardware or operating system. The County is looking to the selected vendor to advise the County of the best hardware and operating system to achieve the maximum results from the selected system.

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

48. The RFP requests that vendors submit questions by June 11. If additional questions arise, what is the final date that questions will be accepted?

Response: We were expecting questions to be presented no later than the pre-proposal conference. If additional questions do arise, submit them as soon as possible. No questions will be accepted after June 24, 2003.

49. What are the volumes of data for each system to be converted?

Response: See Appendix I Column titled "Current Data to Convert" for estimates of volumes. For the HR/Payroll systems, assume 13,300 active employees. Appendix F also contains some data volume information.

50. Do you have a metadata strategy to support the new systems.

Response: No.

51. What are the file formats and record structures for each system to be converted including spreadsheets and department databases(FoxPro) ?

Response: The file format for the GEAC system is VSAM with multiple sub records for each GL account, invoice, vendor, and purchase order.

The file format for the Integral system is also VSAM with multiple sub records for each employee record. The HR/Server system file format is an Oracle database. Time and Attendance is also VSAM fit fixed length records. Applicant System for Schools is an Oracle database where as the Government is an SQL Server database. Training Register is an Access database.

The Fixed Assets system format is a AS/400 database.

For the other miscellaneous systems the County will supply flat files for conversion.

52. What are the file structures of the interface files for the systems to be converted?

Response: All interfaces are sequential (flat file) format.

53. What modeling tool do you use?

Response: The County has used several modeling tools but has no standard.

54. Are there naming standards we will need to follow?

Response: The County uses naming standards for in-house systems and in-house developed programs that interact with packaged systems.

55. Is there a development methodology we will need to follow?

Response: The County uses a standard methodology of requirements, design, development, testing, user acceptance, implementation and post-implementation. We are anticipating vendors will propose a methodology they typically follow for projects such as this.

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

56. What security software do you use?

Response: TopSecret is used for the mainframe. Active Directory is being implemented for LAN accesses and Web intranet applications. See the Technical Features section of Attachment H for the security requirements.

57. Are you aware of any reporting requirements beyond the typical transaction reports provided by the software system (trending analysis, OLAP)?

Response: See the Technical Features section of Attachment H for the reporting requirements.

58. Does the County desire a single system, shared by the County and Schools?

Response: Yes

59. Does the County and Schools have a common chart of accounts. As a follow-up, will there be one set of books or two, one for each governmental entity?

Response: The Government and Schools do not currently share a common chart of accounts, however, we have had a cross-functional team evaluating this and we believe that we can share a common chart of accounts. In regards to one set of books or two, one for each governmental entity:

The Schools are a Component Unit of the County's Reporting Entity for financial reporting purposes. Presently, we account for multiple accounting funds (including multiple fund types) for the Government and for the Schools. The new system should provide the ability to combine multiple funds for external reporting purposes, as well provide the ability to report fund information using different bases of accounting, such as the modified accrual basis and the full accrual basis of accounting.

60. Please clarify the number and type of dedicated resources the County/Schools will devote to the project.

Response: Vendors submitting responses should assume that the County will supply 50% of the resources needed to complete the project for evaluation purposes. Once we are working with an elevated vendor(s), we will more specifically discuss the resources available for the project.

61. With respect to the desired implementation schedule – is it the expectation that both the County and the Schools will go "live" in each phase at the same time.

Response: Yes. That is the expectation and the assumption that should be made for pricing. However, if your firm wants to offer another option that may be advantageous to the County, please feel free to do so, explaining the benefits.

62. What is the data conversion requirement for GL and AP? Page #51 is different than page #67.

Response: Page 51 says how much data the system is to retain for future years; page 67 says how much we want to convert.

63. How or will the current PeopleSoft – JD Edwards – Oracle takeovers/acquisitions influence your decision or winning bid?

Chesterfield County, VA
RFP #03-5107-8820 Pre-proposal Conference Questions
Questions 1 – 48 responses made June 12, 2003 at Conference
Responses to questions 8, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, 28, 37 have been revised; 49 – 68 added

Response: It is difficult to respond to this as these events are unfolding at the present time. It will be mid-August as we elevate vendors for demonstration and the second half of September as we elevate the top vendors for additional evaluation.

64. Please confirm that the prime vendor must have all 5 references in order to qualify to bid - that references from subs will be "considered", but not count as the primary's five references (question 12).

Response: See revised response to question 12, and response to question 41.

65. Will the pre-proposal questions be posted on your website?

Response: Yes, our goal is close of business on Tuesday, June 17.

66. Do you foresee or require any interfaces to the Commonwealth of Virginia, i.e. EVA (State's electronic procurement system)?

Response: Not now, as part of this project.

67. Are you able to further clarify the number of users for the software? How many concurrent users (a reasonable estimate)? (With concurrent being defined as the number signed onto the system at the same time.)

Response: Our best reasonable estimate of this number is 200 users. This number does not include employee self-service entry such as time and attendance information.

68. Are you able to provide the number of concurrent users with concurrent being defined as users submitting data at the exact same time?

Response: Our best estimate of this number of users is 30. This number does not include employee self-service entry such as time and attendance information.